```
Case 3:07-cr-03140-BTM Document 15-2 Filed 01/05/2008 Page 1 of 8
   KAREN P. HEWITT
1
   United States Attorney
   PETER J. MAZZA
   Assistant U.S. Attorney
   California State Bar No. 239918
   Federal Office Building
4
   880 Front Street, Room 6293
   San Diego, California 92101-8893
5
   Telephone: (619) 557-5528
   peter.mazza@usdoj.gov
6
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
7
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
8
9
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                    CASE NO.
                                              07CR3140-BTM
12
                                              January 18, 2008
                                    DATE:
13
             Plaintiff,
                                              1:30 p.m.
                                    TIME:
14
                                    STATEMENT OF FACTS AND MEMORANDUM OF
                                    POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
              v.
15
                                    GOVERNMENT'S MOTIONS FOR RECIPROCAL
                                    DISCOVERY AND TO COMPEL FINGERPRINT
   STEVE VICTOR CUTHBERTSON,
16
                                    EXEMPLARS
17
             Defendant.
18
19
20
        COMES NOW, the plaintiff, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by and
21
   through its counsel, KAREN P. HEWITT, United States Attorney, and
22
   Peter J. Mazza, Assistant United States Attorney, hereby files the
23
   attached statement of facts and memorandum of points and authorities
24
   in support of Government's motion for reciprocal discovery and
25
   fingerprint exemplars.
26
   //
27
   //
28
   //
```

I

2

1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 3 On November 15, 2007, a federal grand jury in the Southern

4 5 6

7

8 9

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21 22

24 25

23

26 27

28

District of California returned a one-count Indictment charging Steve Victor Cuthbertson ("Defendant") with bank robbery, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 2113(a).

On December 3, 2007, the Government produced in discovery 55

pages of written materials, one audio tape, and one dvd. discovery constitutes the full amount of discoverable information the Government has to date. Specifically, it includes: 1) reports generated in response to the ongoing investigation; 2) photographs; 3) Defendant's criminal history; 4) dvd of the beginning of Defendant's post-arrest interview; and 5) audio tape of the remainder of Defendant's post-arrest interview. The Government will continue to fulfill its discovery obligations.

ΙI

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Α. THE INSTANT OFFENSE

On September 15, 2007, at approximately 12:41 p.m., a white male robbed the Bank of America branch located at 845 North Second Street, El Cajon, California ("Bank of America"). The robber approached the teller window of Monette Quintanilla ("victim teller") and gave her a yellow 3" x. 5" "Post-It" note, which read: "Follow these Instructions and everything will be okay I want all your \$20, \$50, \$100 Bills, No Bait money. Do this quickly" [sic]. The victim teller complied with the robber's instructions by placing currency in \$20 and \$50 denominations on the teller counter, and did not include any bait money. While she was emptying her teller drawer,

the robber stated: "Hurry up! Hurry up!" The robber grabbed the money, exited the bank via the south lobby doors, and fled in an unknown direction. The robber left the demand note behind.

The bank suffered a loss of \$4,542.00 as a result of the robbery. At the time of the robbery, the bank's deposits were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). The victim teller failed to activate the bank's alarm, but immediately notified her supervisor of the robbery. Bank surveillance cameras obtained high-quality pictures of the robber, which included his clothing and the dark-colored hiking boots he wore during the robbery.

The victim teller described the robber as follows: white, male, mid-30s, approximately 5'8", heavyset/chunky build, flushed complexion, plaint white t-shirt, jean shorts, sunglasses and running shoes.

On November 1, 2007, the El Cajon Police Department Crime Laboratory reported that it was able to lift latent fingerprints from the demand note the robber left at the bank. A subsequent search of the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) returned a match for Defendant based on his 1998 conviction for growing/cultivating marijuana plants.

Further investigation of Cuthbertson's record revealed that a missing person's report had been filed by his sister on July 22, 2007, with the La Mesa Police Department. The report indicated that he was eventually found to be living with a friend named Mike Bagialo. A search of Bagialo's information indicated that his last known address was 1518 Sams Hill, Unit #59, El Cajon, California. Agents and detectives conducted surveillance of the location on

consecutive days just prior to his arrest that revealed a pick-up truck matching a vehicle registered to Rolfe and Gloria Cuthbertson in the driveway. On November 6, 2007, agents went to this location to investigate further Cuthbertson's whereabouts.

Upon arriving at the Sams Hill residence, Agent Hemmen and El Cajon Police Department Detective Mark Barber knocked on the door. A white male matching Cuthbertson's description opened the door. Detective Barber identified himself and asked the individual his name, to which the individual responded, "Steve." Detective Barber asked him for his last name, and he responded, "Cuthbertson." Agent Hemmen and Detective Barber entered the residence with Defendant's consent. No one else was present other than Defendant. Defendant gave Agent Hemmen and Detective Barber consent to search the bedroom where he kept his personal belongings.

Agent Hemmen and Detective Barber searched the bedroom. Among Defendant's personal items in the room were a pair of Timberland hiking boots that appeared identical to the hiking boots worn by the bank robber in the surveillance photographs. The boots were seized as evidence. No other items worn by the individual in the bank surveillance photographs were located during the search. Agent Hemmen and Detective Barber placed Defendant under arrest.

On November 6, 2007, at approximately 11:30 a.m., Detective Barber and Agent Hemmen interviewed Defendant. Defendant was informed of his <u>Miranda</u> rights and agreed to make a statement. Defendant admitted to robbing a Bank of America branch located in El Cajon, California. Defendant further stated that on the day of the robbery, he entered the bank on three separate occasions, the third entry for the purpose of robbing the bank. He stated that he entered

the bank and waited in line for the next available teller. He recalled handing the bank teller a demand note once he had approached the teller counter, but could not remember the type of paper or what he had written. He stated that after he took the money, he exited the bank and drove away in his truck. He informed agents that he used most of the \$4,542 to purchase alcohol over the last two months.

III

GOVERNMENT'S MOTIONS

A. MOTION FOR RECIPROCAL DISCOVERY

1. RULE 16(b)

The United States, pursuant to Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, requests that Defendant permit the United States to inspect, copy, and photograph any and all books, papers, documents, photographs, tangible objects, or make copies of portions thereof, which are within the possession, custody or control of Defendant and which Defendant intends to introduce as evidence in his case-in-chief at trial.

The United States further requests that it be permitted to inspect and copy or photograph any results or reports of physical or mental examinations and of scientific tests or experiments made in connection with this case, which are in the possession or control of Defendant, which Defendant intends to introduce as evidence-in-chief at the trial, or which were prepared by a witness whom Defendant intends to call as a witness. Because the United States has complied with its obligations for delivery of reports of examinations, the United States is entitled to the items listed above under Rule 16(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The United States also requests that the Court make such order as it deems

necessary under Rules 16(d)(1) and (2) to ensure that the United States receives the discovery to which it is entitled.

2. RULE 26.2

Rule 26.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure requires the production of prior statements of all witnesses, except a statement made by Defendant. This rule thus provides for the reciprocal production of <u>Jencks</u> statements.

The time frame established by the rule requires the statement to be provided after the witness has testified. To expedite trial proceedings, the United States hereby requests that Defendant be ordered to supply all prior statements of defense witnesses by a reasonable date before trial to be set by the Court. Such an order should include any form in which these statements are memorialized, including but not limited to, tape recordings, handwritten or typed notes and/or reports.

B. Motion to Compel Fingerprint Exemplars

The Government requests that Defendant be ordered to make himself available for fingerprint exemplars at a time and place convenient to the Government's fingerprint expert. See United States v. Kloepper, 725 F. Supp. 638, 640 (D. Mass. 1989) (the District Court has "inherent authority" to order a defendant to provide handwriting exemplars, fingerprints, and palmprints). Since the fingerprint exemplars are sought for the sole purpose of proving Defendant's identity, rather for than investigatory purposes, the Fourth Amendment is not implicated. The Ninth Circuit in United States v. Ortiz-Hernandez, 427 F.3d 567, 576-79 (9th Cir. 2005), upheld the Government's ability to compel a defendant to submit to fingerprinting for purposes of identification at trial. See United

Case 3:07-cr-03140-BTM Document 15-2 Filed 01/05/2008 Page 7 of 8

States v. Garcia-Beltran, 389 F.3d 864, 866-68 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing United States v. Parqa-Rosas, 238 F.3d 1209, 1215 (9th Cir. 2001)). Furthermore, an order requiring Defendant to provide fingerprint exemplars does not infringe on Defendant's Fifth Amendment rights. See Schmerber v. California, 384 U.S. 757, 770-71 (1966) (the Fifth Amendment privilege "offers no protection against compulsion to submit to fingerprinting"); Williams v. Schario, 93 F.3d 527, 529 (8th Cir. 1996) (the taking of fingerprints in the absence of Miranda warnings did not constitute testimonial incrimination as proscribed by the Fifth Amendment).

IV

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the United States requests that the Government's Motions be granted.

DATED: January 5, 2008.

Respectfully Submitted,

KAREN P. HEWITT United States Attorney

/<u>s/Peter J. Mazza</u>
PETER J. MAZZA
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Peter.Mazza@usdoj.gov

Case 3:07-cr-03140-BTM Document 15-2 Filed 01/05/2008 Page 8 of 8